

# **EXHIBIT 45**

**Redacted Version of  
Document Sought to  
be Sealed**

## Message

**From:** Chris Palmer [palmer@google.com]  
**Sent:** 6/21/2016 8:47:23 PM  
**To:** Sabine Borsay [sabineb@google.com]  
**CC:** Lucas Garron [lgarron@google.com]; Emily Schechter [emilyschechter@google.com]; Aaron Stein [steina@google.com]; Stephan Somogyi [somogyi@google.com]; Alex Ainslie [ainslie@google.com]; Wieland Holfelder [holfelder@google.com]; Mark Larson [mal@google.com]; Parisa Tabriz [parisa@google.com]; Ben Wells [benwells@google.com]; \* Varun Khaneja [vakh@google.com]; Adrienne Porter Felt [felt@google.com]; Joel Weinberger [jww@google.com]; [REDACTED] (core members) [REDACTED]@google.com; Maximilian Walker [maxwalker@google.com]; Chrome Privacy Muc [chrome-privacy-muc@google.com]; Dominic Battre [battre@google.com]  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED] Google "Incognito" Precision

I've already made my case (for 5 years now), and so won't bore you with a meeting. :) But please note that nothing will be more scannable than the name and the icon, both of which are a poor fit for what the feature actually provides.

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 1:40 PM, Sabine Borsay <[sabineb@google.com](mailto:sabineb@google.com)> wrote:

I've stated this already on a related thread -- Eric Schmidt's exact statement was written in our Security & Privacy one-pager comms doc. So he most likely didn't go through a thought process concluding that misinterpretation about how Chrome Incognito works, but just learned the points from comms doc. Over the last couple of years, we've run numerous user studies on user perception and expectation and while some users do have some misconceptions, it seems less widespread than you assume. But stay tuned, we're working on a redesign of the Incognito NTP with two main goals: 1.) better scannability of the content around what it does offer and what it doesn't, 2.) illustrating the use case it does support. The reason why I mentioned that our messaging is pretty clear was to highlight that the only proactive comms I could imagine would be to explicitly call out the differences between Allo's and Chrome's Incognito mode. Again, if Chrome Security team wants to post something on the Chrome Security FAQs, we can draft something together with PR. Let me know.

I don't think we should abandon the Incognito mode brand because of the Allo launch. Happy to discuss more in a meeting.

On 21 June 2016 at 22:34, Lucas Garron <[lgarron@google.com](mailto:lgarron@google.com)> wrote:

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 1:21 PM Chris Palmer <[palmer@google.com](mailto:palmer@google.com)> wrote:

Although our Incognito messaging is clear, people (everyone from internet randos to bug reporters to Eric Schmidt)

Although it feels like I'm just piling on to Chris's comments, I think this cannot be understated.

Even Eric Schmidt couldn't even keep the core meaning of Incognito straight **when it only meant one thing.**

generally haven't understood it. So it's not clear enough. I suspect the confusion arises due to the tension inherent between <https://www.chromium.org/Home/chromium-security/security-faq#TOC-Why-aren-t-physically-local-attacks-in-Chrome-s-threat-model-> and what Incognito offers.

And although we and they have clear messages, Allo effectively ruined the clarity of our message by using our name for a thing that is very different from our thing.

We should proactively communicate about this. But we should also abandon the Incognito name, and change Incognito to "Temporary Mode" or whatever else you like. Allo's definition of the term is much stronger and makes much more sense.

I don't know how proactive we should be, but we should definitely have good answers ready about the distinction, and the decision to use the same name.

(And/or use this as a chance to rebrand Incognito in Chrome, which has always been an over-reaching name. But that won't be as easy, and sounds like it is counter to our lofty branding desires.)

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 12:49 PM, Sabine Borsay <[sabineb@google.com](mailto:sabineb@google.com)> wrote:

Happy to work with PR on comms for this. Though I was not planning to do proactive comms about the distinction to Allo's Incognito mode, since we're already pretty clear in our external comms (Help Center, Incognito NTP, etc.) about what Chrome Incognito does offer and what it does not offer. And our agreement with the Allo team was that they're clear about the functionality of their feature as well. Do I understand it correctly that the Chrome Security team however want to publish proactive comms around this? If so, I'm happy to collaborate on the draft. Let me know!

On 10 June 2016 at 01:45, Emily Schechter <[emilyschechter@google.com](mailto:emilyschechter@google.com)> wrote:

+ steina and somogyi from the Security PR perspective

Do you know who the right folks are to work with here?

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:57 PM, Lucas Garron <[lgarron@google.com](mailto:lgarron@google.com)> wrote:

\*volatile and isolated from regular profiles

Higher-level folks, are we allowed to put something like this on the security FAQ? Do we need sign-off from anyone, and how would we get it?

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:52 PM Chris Palmer <[palmer@google.com](mailto:palmer@google.com)> wrote:

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:40 PM, Lucas Garron <[lgarron@google.com](mailto:lgarron@google.com)> wrote:

Should we add something to the Chrome Security FAQ?

I'm afraid the only correct thing we can say is "Incognito in Chrome has no technical relation to Incognito in Allo. They both give you better privacy than their respective regular modes, relative to the pragmatic threat models we have selected."

How about:

"Although Allo and Chrome both have features that go by the same name and use the same logo, they are designed to support very different threat models and use-cases. Allo's Incognito mode employs <a href="TODO">end to end encryption</a>, which is an additional layer of encryption for messages above and beyond the TLS Allo uses for transport. Chrome's Incognito mode is designed only to ensure that local browser state is volatile, and makes no further guarantees of confidentiality (such as confidentiality from 3rd parties or of network traffic)."

--  
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Enamel (core members)"

PRODBEG: GOOG-BRWN-00410884  
PRODBEGATT:  
PRODEND: GOOG-BRWN-00410886  
PRODENDATT:  
PRODVOL: PROD029  
2nd\_CROSS\_BEGBATES:  
2nd\_CROSS\_ENDBATES:  
AllCustodians: Sabine Borsay  
TO: sabine borsay <sabineb@google.com>  
FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>  
CC: emily schechter <emilyschechter@google.com>; aaron stein <steina@google.com>; joel weinberger <jww@google.com>; maximilian walker <maxwalker@google.com>; lucas garron <lgarron@google.com>; mark larson <mal@google.com>; parisa tabriz <parisa@google.com>; alex ainslie <ainslie@google.com>; stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>; ben wells <benwells@google.com>; "████████ (core members)" <████████@google.com>; ☆ varun khaneja <vakh@google.com>; wieland holfelder <holfelder@google.com>; dominic battre <battre@google.com>; chrome privacy muc <chrome-privacy-muc@google.com>; adrienne porter felt <felt@google.com>  
>  
BCC:  
CONFIDENTIALITY: Confidential  
CROSS\_ALLCUSTODIANS: Sabine Borsay  
CROSS\_ATTACHMENTNAME:  
CROSS\_BEGATTACH:  
CROSS\_BEGBATES: GOOG-CABR-00149426  
CROSS\_CC: emily schechter <emilyschechter@google.com>; aaron stein <steina@google.com>; joel weinberger <jww@google.com>; maximilian walker <maxwalker@google.com>; lucas garron <lgarron@google.com>; mark larson <mal@google.com>; parisa tabriz <parisa@google.com>; alex ainslie <ainslie@google.com>; stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>; ben wells <benwells@google.com>; "████████ (core members)" <████████@google.com>; ☆ varun khaneja <vakh@google.com>; wieland holfelder <holfelder@google.com>; dominic battre <battre@google.com>; chrome privacy muc <chrome-privacy-muc@google.com>; adrienne porter felt <felt@google.com>  
CROSS\_CONFIDENTIALITY: CONFIDENTIAL  
CROSS\_CUSTODIAN: Sabine Borsay  
CROSS\_DATECREATED:  
CROSS\_DATEMOD: 06/21/2016  
CROSS\_DATERECEIVED: 06/21/2016  
CROSS\_DATESENT: 06/21/2016  
CROSS\_DE-DUPED CUSTODIANS: Sabine Borsay  
CROSS\_ENDATTACH:  
CROSS\_ENDBATES: GOOG-CABR-00149428  
CROSS\_FILEEXTENSION: eml  
CROSS\_FILENAME:  
CROSS\_FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>  
CROSS\_MD5 HASH: 7BBA5A9EB9777FBEF274C618BAFA125B  
CROSS\_MESSAGE ID: <CAOuvq20wUOup1zL3AdL46Ch86Jx+xfz19P+BN1epiOyP4Fpadg@mail.gmail.com>  
CROSS\_OWNER: palmer  
CROSS\_PRODVAL: CROSS-PROD002  
CROSS\_REDACTED: N  
CROSS SUBJECT: Re: ██████████ Google "Incognito" Precision

CROSS\_TITLE: Re: [REDACTED] Google "Incognito" Precision  
CROSS\_TO: sabine borsay <sabineb@google.com>  
CUSTODIAN/SOURCE: Sabine Borsay  
DATECREATED:  
DATELASTMOD: 06/21/2016  
DATERCVD:  
DATESENT:  
DeDupedCustodians:  
DOCEXT:  
FILENAME:  
ILS\_ProdDate: 07/16/2021  
CROSS\_ILS\_ProdDate: 09/01/2021  
MD5 HASH: 7BBA5A9EB9777FBEF274C618BAFA125B  
MessageID:  
NATIVEFILE:  
Owner: palmer  
PAGES:  
REDACTED: N  
SUBJECT: Re: [REDACTED] Google "Incognito" Precision

group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to [enamelites+unsubscribe@google.com](mailto:enamelites+unsubscribe@google.com).

To post to this group, send email to [enamelites@google.com](mailto:enamelites@google.com).

--  
[REDACTED] | [sabineb@google.com](mailto:sabineb@google.com)

--  
[REDACTED] | [sabineb@google.com](mailto:sabineb@google.com)